

REMARKS

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 4 as being anticipated by Cane (US 5,999,203). In response the Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from Cane.
2. The Applicant has included the limitation in claim 1 that the print head comprises "*a page-width print head.*" The Applicant submits that this claim restriction is fairly based on the specification as a whole, and, in particular upon the last paragraph on page 10 which reads:

"The ink supply cartridge 42 is based around a pagewidth printhead 102 which comprises a long slither of silicon having a series of holes etched on the back surface for the supply of ink to a front surface of the silicon wafer for subsequent ejection via a micro electro mechanical system."
3. The Applicant further submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Cane because Cane does not disclose a page width print head, but instead discloses an eight dot thermal print head which traverses the print media in order to print the photo (See col. 13, lines 53 to 57, col 14, lines 5 to 9, col.8, lines 15 to 18).
4. One of the many advantages of the Applicant's page width print head over Cane's print head is that the Applicant's print head does not need to be passed laterally across the print media during the printing process. This removes the need for complicated print head drive mechanisms. By having such a page width print head, the Applicant's camera system may be manufactured in a more compact form than that of Cane.
5. The Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is novel in light of Cane and requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.
6. The Examiner has maintained the double patenting objection to claim 1 in light of US 6,152,619. Although the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's suggestion that the two patents claim the same invention, the Applicant is nonetheless willing to enter an appropriate terminal disclaimer. The relevant terminal disclaimer documents are filed together with this response.
7. The Examiner has also maintained the objection to the substitute specification lodged on 17 June 2002. The Applicant submits that the following US patents were granted with similar lists of cross-referenced applications:

6,041,600	6,196,739	6,231,163	6,241,906	6,254,793	6,274,056
6,044,646	6,209,989	6,231,772	6,243,113	6,257,704	6,280,643
6,067,797	6,213,588	6,231,773	6,244,691	6,257,705	6,283,581
6,071,750	6,213,589	6,234,609	6,245,247	6,258,284	6,283,582
6,087,638	6,214,244	6,234,610	6,247,790	6,258,285	6,284,147
6,106,147	6,217,153	6,234,611	6,247,791	6,260,953	6,289,262
6,110,754	6,217,165	6,235,211	6,247,792	6,264,306	6,304,291
6,137,500	6,220,694	6,235,212	6,247,793	6,264,307	6,305,770
6,152,619	6,224,780	6,238,033	6,247,794	6,264,849	6,315,200
6,171,875	6,225,138	6,238,040	6,247,795	6,264,850	6,317,192
6,180,427	6,227,652	6,238,111	6,247,796	6,267,469	6,322,181
6,188,415	6,227,653	6,239,821	6,248,248	6,267,904	6,353,772
6,190,931	6,227,654	6,241,342	6,248,249	6,267,905	6,356,715
6,195,150	6,228,668	6,241,904	6,251,298	6,270,182	6,366,693
6,196,541	6,231,148	6,241,905	6,254,220	6,271,931	

In the interests of consistent Examination, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

Kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9818 6711